REMARKS

Claims 2, 6, 14-25, and 27-29 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 26, and 34 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. New claim 46 has been added. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-13, 26, and 30-46 are pending.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 34 because of an informality. The typographic mistake has been corrected. Namely, the unnumbered claim has been removed from Claim 34 and a new Claim 46 has been added.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7-13, 26, and 30-45 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for being indefinite. Independent claims 1, 26, and 34 have been amended in a manner believed to overcome the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 of those claims. The amendments are also believed to overcome Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 of claims 7 and 8. As claims 3-5 and 9-13, and 30-33 depend from Claim 1, and claims 35-45 depend from Claim 34, the rejection of those dependent claims, respectively, under 35 U.S.C. §112 is believed to be overcome accordingly.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7-13, 26, and 30-45 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The rejection is respectfully traversed. The claims have been amended in a manner that is believed to overcome the rejections. Specifically, the independent claims have been amended to recite rolling back the computer resource if it is determined that the roll-back state is secure, which is a tangible, concrete, and useful result. The Specification has been in a manner also believed to overcome the Examiner's rejection of Claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7-13, 26, and 30-45 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Colligan (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,443). That rejection is respectfully traversed. Colligan describes a protection mechanism in which a key is used to restrict the utilization of licensed software to the single unique computer for which the license is granted. (Colligan at 6:60-67). The "restoration process" described in Colligan checks to make sure the user is licensed to install the software (by validating the key) and then "clears the hard disk drive by formatting the hard drive." (Colligan at 9:1-18). Checking to see whether a user is licensed

to install software, and then clearing the user's hard drive is not "determining whether the roll-back state is secure" as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 3-5, 7-13, and 30-33 depend from Claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Independent Claims and 26 and 34 recite limitations similar to Claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 35-46 depend from Claim 34 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _S/29/07_

Robyn Wagner
Registration No. 50,575
V 408-973-2596
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014